



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,219	08/18/2003	Gokay Albayrak	TRW(ASG) 5941-1	3453

7590 01/14/2005
TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, TUMMINO & SZABO L.L.P.
1111 LEADER BLDG.
628 SUPERIOR AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-1400

EXAMINER

LUONG, VINH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3682

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/643,219		Applicant(s) ALBAYRAK ET AL.	
	Examiner Vinh T Luong		Art Unit 3682	

All Participants:

(1) Vinh T Luong.

(2) Thomas L. Tarolli.

Date of Interview: 11 January 2005

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: about 2:50 PM

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
7 and 10

Prior art documents discussed:
US Patent No. 6,644,145 B2

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Vinh T. Luong
Primary Examiner


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner informed the Applicants that claim 7 is allowed over the art of record, however, new claim 10 necessitated a new ground of rejection under judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claims 1 and 3 of US Patent No. 6,644,145. The Examiner pointed out that claim 10 does not claim two shell parts 22a and 22b of the species of Fig. 2, thus, claim 10 is generic and read on the species of Fig. 3 elected in parent Application No. 09/973,204. The Examiner suggested that Applicants should either cancel new claim 10 or file a terminal disclaimer to put the case in the condition for allowance. Applicants would inform the Examiner of their decision within one week.



Vinh T. Luong
Primary Examiner